

Remarks

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 through 11 remain pending in the application. Claim 19 is added by amendment.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 3, and includes additional limitations to more clearly distinguish the claim from Masuda. The claims are amended to make clear that, in the claimed invention, the primary repeater and auxiliary repeater are operable to communicate cell system signals through to the cell phone and communicate signals originating at the cell phone to the cell system.

Masuda clearly teaches against the claimed invention. Regarding his Figure 4, Masuda states:

This embodiment also assumes that cooperation of a telephone company that operates the wireless communications system in restricting the use of mobile terminals in a specific space is obtained.

Paragraph 50, relied on to establish the rejection of the claims, refers to Figure 3 of Masuda, which does not provide for relay of the cell system downlink through the repeaters to cell phones. To the contrary, paragraph 0047 of Masuda makes clear that repeater 310 is used to disrupt communication between the cell system and the cell phone. The examiner points out that in Masuda "There is a functionality of disabling the communication, but when not disabled the communication reads on applicant's claims." But when not disabled, as shown in Figure 3, communication from the cell system to the cell phone is direct, and bypasses the repeater. Neither Masuda's Figure 3 or Figure

4 provide for communication of signals originating at the cell system to the cell phone through the repeaters, while the claims as amended provide for relay of cell system downlink signals through the repeaters to the cell phone. Thus, Masuda and the other references do not disclose all the elements of the amended claims, and the combination of those references will not meet the claims. Masuda's express motivation to disrupt communications to cell phones in the enclosed environment negates any motivation to modify his system to do the opposite.

Regarding claim 9 and 10, it appears from the Examiner's table that the examiner is confusing control of communications with control of the conveyance, as there is utterly no indication in Masuda that any part of his signal is used to control the conveyance in which the system is implemented.

Conclusion

This response has addressed all of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. The rejections based on prior art have been traversed. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims is requested.

Date: April 26, 2007

By: /K. David Crockett/

K. David Crockett, Esq.
Reg. No. 34311